



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

other three all instructed men. Such an army would not be an economic drain on the country, and would be free from the objections that might be raised against conscription or a large regular army.

THOS. G. FROTHINGHAM.

BOSTON, MASS.

NEUTRALITY AND THE SALE OF MUNITIONS

SIR,—As you are doubtless aware, the Organization of American Women, originated in Baltimore, was financed, it is said, by Germans of that city. This organization was formed for one cause only—to prevent England getting munitions of war. The most heartbreaking appeals have been made to women, through the newspapers. Of course, you look with disdain upon such communications, but they were largely instrumental in securing two million signatures. In replying to one such communication, I quoted you, because I considered you an authority. May I ask what was your authority for the “second principle of neutrality” that you named in the leading editorial in the June issue of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*?

I. M. STUART.

BALTIMORE, MD.

[The principles of neutrality governing the sale of munitions of war to the belligerents were authoritatively enunciated in a letter of the Secretary of State in answer to Senator Stone as early as January of the present year. We quote, for the comfort of our correspondent, the following paragraphs from that official document:

“There is no power in the Executive to prevent the sale of ammunition to the belligerents.

“The duty of a neutral to restrict trade in munitions of war has never been imposed by international law or by municipal statute. It has never been the policy of this Government to prevent the shipment of arms or ammunition into belligerent territory, except in the case of neighboring American Republics, and then only when civil strife prevailed. Even to this extent the belligerents in the present conflict, when they were neutrals, have never, so far as the records disclose, limited the sale of munitions of war. It is only necessary to point to the enormous quantities of arms and ammunitions furnished by manufacturers in Germany to the belligerents in the Russo-Japanese war and in the recent Balkan wars to establish the general recognition of the propriety of the trade by a neutral nation.”—EDITOR.]

MRS. AUSTIN'S PSYCHOGENY OF CHRIST

SIR,—Permit me to congratulate you upon the conclusion of “The Man Jesus,” by Mary Austin—hardly as an achievement, but rather as the termination of a melancholy and unhappy piece of business: melancholy, because of its contrast with the work of truly ingenious exegetes like Harnack or the unfortunate and errant Abbé Loisy: unhappy, because of its self-defeating inconsistencies and self-contradictions in such an essential and imperative matter, among others, as the Resurrection.

I dare say, Sir, that in your private capacity as a lay reader you would generously have rescued Mrs. Austin from these inconsistencies and contradictions. In your editorial capacity, of course, you had almost necessarily to allow her to make the best of her way through them. It has

been a very labored and tortuous way indeed. Somewhere on the journey, not only the divinity, but even the personality of Christ disappeared utterly, until, were it not blasphemous to say it, one must protest that even the succinct Scholastic definition of man as "animal rationalis" barely applies in substantive—let alone adjective—to Mrs. Austin's psychogeny of the Saviour.

Permit me, then, to renew my felicitations, and to offer the respectful suggestion that you spare us the annoyance of feeble assaults upon our orthodoxy until such time as a really worthy critic challenges the field and winds his horn outside our gates.

THOMAS QUINN BEESLEY.

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

FROM A MINISTERIAL FRIEND

SIR,—I fell in love with THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW while a student in college—reading it regularly from the college library table. When about to be graduated I entered my subscription for THE REVIEW, have renewed it regularly ever since, and shall continue to "so long as we both shall live." It is supreme in its particular sphere.

October's issue ranks as the equal of any of the preceding issues. Rear Admiral Fiske's article on "The Mastery of the World" is worth the price of one year's subscription to THE REVIEW. His logic is sound, and thus his arguments are convincing. I am a minister of the gospel and would like to discredit Admiral Fiske's conclusions. I accept them because I must. So much of the literature bearing on the war which comes to my study is idealistic, theoretical and mostly bagatelle. What ground is there to believe that this is "The Last War"? I write merely to express my appreciation of Admiral Fiske's article. Let us have more of such thoughtful, sane, frank statements of the matter.

C. W. KITTO.

YARDLEY, PENN.

THE PULCHRITUDE OF JOHN BRIGHT

SIR,—May I ask space for a small correction? Whether by the printer's fault or mine, some words have slipped out on page 371 of my article on John Bright in the October issue of THE REVIEW. What I meant to say was that Bright "was a very much better-looking man *in old age* than in middle life." I think the correction worth making.

GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL.

LONDON.

[The omission noted by Mr. Russell was due not to any fault of his, but to the innate viciousness of the type.

—EDITOR.]